



RECEIVED  
JUL 07 2003  
GROUP 1700

### REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-36 were rejected. By the present Response, claims 1, 4, 9, 19, 20, 23, 27, and 33-35 have been amended. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-35 will remain pending in the present patent application. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

#### Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because: “‘96’ should be changed to ‘94’ in Figure 7 to obtain correct labeling of the hex nuts.” However, reference number “96” of Figure 7 is labeled correctly. The items labeled “96” in Figure 7 are not hex nuts, but are recesses adapted to receive a hex nut 94 of the welding cable 34. *See* Application, page 11, line 16-19. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because of informalities. Specifically, the Examiner stated that: “on page 9, 13<sup>th</sup> line, ‘first end 58’ should be changed to ‘second end 60’. On page 12, 11<sup>th</sup> line, ‘43’ should be changed to ‘42’.” The specification has been amended in light of the Examiner’s comments. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### Objections to the Claims

Claims 23 and 32 were objected to because of the following informalities: “in claim 23, 2<sup>nd</sup> line, ‘inches’ should be added after ‘4.2’. In claim 32, 10<sup>th</sup> line, ‘handlepieces’ should be changed to ‘handle pieces’.” Claims 23 and 32 have been amended in light of the Examiners comments. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 19, 20, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 19 and 20 have been amended by this response in light of the Examiner's comments.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 33. Claim 33 is not indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 32 recites "the first and second handle pieces being positionable relative to the neck to enable the position of the trigger on the welding handle to be varied from a first position to a second position, *the second position being directly opposite the first position*. Claim 33, which depends from claim 32, recites: "wherein the second position is vertical relative to the first position." Thus, for example, the first position may correspond to a position on the bottom of the handle and the second position may correspond to a position on the top of the handle. In this example, the second position of the trigger would be directly opposite the first position and would be vertical relative to the first position. Thus, claim 33 is not indefinite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**First Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 5, 6, 8, 16-18, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stuart et al. (hereinafter "Stuart"), U.S. Patent No. 5,491,321. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. A *prima facie* case of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires a showing that each limitation of a claim is found in a single reference, practice or device. *In re Donohue*, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 5, 6, 8, 16-18, and 26 are not anticipated because the Stuart reference does not disclose all of the recited features of the claims. One of the recited features of

independent claim 5 that is not disclosed by Stuart is “a gripping portion, wherein the gripping portion increases in cross-sectional area from a first location between the first and second ends in each direction towards the first and second ends.” Similarly, one of the recited features of independent claim 16 that is not disclosed by Stuart is “a gripping portion between the first and second ends, wherein the handle increases in cross-sectional area from the gripping portion in each direction towards the first and second ends.” In addition, the Stuart reference does not disclose: “a gripping portion, wherein the gripping portion is adapted to cooperate with a corresponding welding handle piece to increase cross-sectional area of the handle in each direction towards the first and second end portions,” as recited in independent claim 26.

Furthermore, the Stuart reference does not support the Examiner’s assertion that Stuart discloses a “handle portion 56, and trigger 34, in which the (hand-held) portion of the handle includes portions with increasing cross-section toward the upper and lower ends of the handle (below trigger 34) with respect to the central portion of the (hand-held) handle.” None of the portions of the Stuart reference cited by the Examiner disclose anything about the hand-held portion of the handle including portions with increasing cross-section toward the upper and lower ends of the handle.

In fact, the Stuart reference suggests quite the opposite. The Stuart reference discloses a pistol grip type of handle with a wire feed control 36 extending downwardly and generally perpendicular to the handle portion 56. *See* Stuart, col.7, lines 39-42. The outer surface of the wire feed control includes a plurality of ridges 58 which facilitate the operator’s grip of the spool gun assembly 32. Stuart, col.7, lines 42-45. As illustrated in Figure 9, the ridges 58 are disposed on a central portion of the wire feed control 36. There are wider portions of the wire feed control 36 illustrated, but not identified, in Figure 9. However, these portions are not “gripping portions” because there are no ridges 58 disposed on the wider portions of the wire feed control 36. Furthermore, the orientation of the trigger 34 adjacent to the central portion, illustrated in Figure 9,

provides further support that the wider portions of wire feed control 36, at a distance from the central portion, are not “gripping portions.” However, as illustrated in Figure 9, Stuart does not disclose that the central portion of the wire feed control 36 increases in cross-sectional area from a first location between the first and second ends in each direction towards the wider portions of the wire feed control. Therefore, the Stuart reference does not disclose all of the recited features of independent claims 5, 16, and 26.

Accordingly, claims 5, 16, and 26 are not anticipated by the Stuart reference. Claims 6, 8, 17, and 18 depend from independent claim 5 and 16, respectively. Therefore, Stuart does not anticipate claims 6, 8, 17, and 18. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

**Second Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 16 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zigliotto, U.S. Patent No. 5,965,045. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 16 and 26 are not anticipated because the Zigliotto reference does not disclose all of the recited features of the claims. As with the Stuart reference above, one of the recited features of independent claim 16 that is not disclosed by Stuart is: “a gripping portion between the first and second ends, wherein the handle increases in cross-sectional area from the gripping portion in each direction towards the first and second ends.” Similarly, Zigliotto does not disclose: “a gripping portion, wherein the gripping portion is adapted to cooperate with a corresponding welding handle piece to increase cross-sectional area of the handle in each direction towards the first and second end portions,” as recited in independent claim 26. Furthermore, the cited portions of the Zigliotto reference do not support the Examiner’s assertions in the Office Action. Zigliotto does disclose a handle 2. *See* Zigliotto, col. 1, lines 57-60. However, Zigliotto does not disclose anything about the handle 2 having first and second ends with increasing cross-section toward upper and lower ends of the handle 2. Therefore, the

Stuart reference does not disclose all of the recited features of independent claims 16 and 26.

Accordingly, claims 16 and 26 are not anticipated by the Stuart reference. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

**Third Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dimock et al. (hereinafter (“Dimock”), U.S. Patent No. 5,571,427. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 24 and 25 are not anticipated because the Dimock reference does not disclose all of the recited features of the claims. One of the recited features of independent claim 24 that is not disclosed by the Dimock is: “a first and a second receiving portion adapted to *capture* a welding cable connector when secured to a corresponding welding handle piece.” Dimock discloses a torch head 14, a handle 16, and a cable set 18 comprising a water cable 22, a gas cable 24, and a power cable 26. *See* Dimock, col. 3, lines 1-5. However, the handle 16 does not capture the cable set 18, neither the first end 76 nor the second end 78. Furthermore, the Examiner did not identify any portion of Dimock that is “adapted to *capture* a welding cable connector,” as recited in claim 24. Therefore, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of anticipation of claim 24. In fact, the cable set 18 is disposed through a first end of the handle 16 and connected to power 34, coolant 36, and gas 38 connectors of the torch head 14, not the handle 16. *See* Dimock, Figure 1. Neither the first end 76 nor the second end 78 of the handle 16 is adapted to *capture* a cable connector. Furthermore, neither the first end nor the second end of the handle 16 is secured to a corresponding handle piece. The handle 16 of the Dimock is a one-piece handle, not handle pieces adapted to be secured together. Therefore, the Dimock reference does not disclose all of the recited features of independent claim 24.

Accordingly, independent claim 24 is not anticipated by the Dimock reference. Claim 25 depends from independent claim 24. Therefore, claim 25 also is not anticipated by the Dimock reference.

**Fourth Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Erickson et al. (hereinafter “Erickson”), U.S. Patent No. 4,250,366. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 24 and 25 are not anticipated because the Erickson reference does not disclose all of the recited features of the claims. Some of the recited features of claim 24 that are not disclosed by Erickson are “*a first and a second receiving portion* adapted to *capture* a welding cable connector when secured to a corresponding welding handle piece, each receiving portion being located at an *opposite end* of the welding handle piece.” Furthermore, the Examiner did not identify those portions of the Erickson reference that are “adapted to capture a welding cable connector,” as recited in claim 24. Therefore, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Erickson discloses a welding gun 10 having a handle 24 formed of two halves, which are fastened together. *See* Erickson, col. 2, lines 25-35. In addition, a cable clamp 30 serves to secure a cable 70 in the welding gun 10. *See* Erickson, col. 2, lines 35-37. The cable clamp 30 is captured between the two halves of the handle 24 at one end to secure the cable 70 to the gun 10. *See* Erickson, Figure 1. However, only one end of the handle 24 is adapted to capture the cable clamp 30, not two. The end of the handle 24 opposite the cable clamp 30 is adapted to receive the cable 70 therethrough, but not to capture the cable clamp 30. Therefore, the handle 24 of Erickson does not have *a first and a second receiving portion* adapted to *capture* a welding cable connector, each receiving portion being located at an *opposite end* of the handle piece.

Accordingly, independent claim 24 is not anticipated by the Erickson reference. Claim 25 depends from independent claim 24. Therefore, claim 25 also is not anticipated by the Erickson reference.

**Fifth Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Colman, U.S. Patent No. 4,403,136. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 24 and 25 are not anticipated because the Colman reference does not disclose all of the recited features of the claims. Some of the recited features of claim 24 that are not disclosed by the Colman reference are “a first and a second receiving portion adapted to *capture a welding cable connector* when secured to a corresponding welding handle piece, each receiving portion being located at an *opposite end* of the welding handle piece.” Furthermore, the Examiner did not identify those portions of the reference that are “adapted to capture a welding cable connector,” as recited in claim 24. Therefore, the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of anticipation of claim 24. Colman discloses a gun 10 having a connected to a supply cable 12. *See* Colman, col. 2, lines 57-61. In addition, Colman discloses that the welding gun 10 has a handle assembly 13 comprising a left housing member 14, a right rear housing member 16, and a right front housing member 18. *See* Colman, col. 2, lines 61-65. The supply cable 12 is connected to a male connector member 52 between the left housing member 14 and the right front housing member 18. *See* Colman, col. 3, lines 59-63. However, the left housing member 14 and the right front housing member 18 are not adapted to capture the male connector member 52. Therefore, Colman does not disclose even one receiving portion “adapted to *capture a welding cable connector* when secured to a corresponding welding handle piece,” as recited in claim 24, much less two at opposite ends of the welding handle piece.

Furthermore, Colman does not disclose “a first and a second receiving portion adapted to *capture a welding cable connector*, each receiving portion being located at an opposite end of the handle piece,” as recited in claim 24. The opposite end of the gun 10 is not adapted to capture the male connector member 52. The opposite end of the gun 10 is adapted to clamp the supply conductor 12, not the connector member 52. A passageway 21 is formed between the right rear housing member 16 and the left housing member 14 when they are attached together. *See Colman, col. 2, line 68-col. 3, line 1.* The supply conductor 12 is clamped between the right rear housing member 16 and the left housing member 14 in the passageway. *See Colman, col. 3, lines 1-6.* Therefore, Colman does not disclose all of the recited features of claim 24.

Accordingly, independent claim 24 is not anticipated by the Colman reference. Claim 25 depends from independent claim 24. Therefore, claim 25 also is not anticipated by the Colman reference.

#### **First Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 11, 15, 30, 31, 34, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matasovic, U.S. Patent No. 3,689,733. Claims 1, 4, 9, 34, and 35 have been amended by this response. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

#### **Claims 1, 2, and 4**

Claims 1, 2, and 4 are patentable because the Matasovic reference does not disclose all of the recited features of the claims. One of the recited features of amended independent claim 1 that is not disclosed or suggested by the Matasovic reference is “a first recess operable to receive the member therein in a first direction relative to the handle.” Matasovic discloses a wire-carrying liner 24, a flexible gas hose 34, a power cable 37, and control wires 39 housed within a tubular jacket 38. *See Matasovic, col. 3, lines 1-4, 28-30, and 36-43.* Matasovic also discloses a gooseneck tube 26 that is secured to a hollow cylinder base member 28. *See Matasovic, col. 3, lines 10-18 and 36-39.* The

handle 13 comprises a handle tube 47 that is disposed over the hollow cylinder base member 28. *See* Matasovic, col. 4, lines 35-38. However, the handle tube 47 does not have a recess operable to receive the base member 28. Therefore, the Matasovic reference does not disclose or suggest “a first recess operable to receive the member therein in a first direction relative to the handle,” as recited in claim 1. Similarly, Matasovic does not disclose or suggest “a second recess operable to receive the member therein in a second direction relative to the handle, the second direction being opposite the first direction,” also recited in claim 1. Therefore, the Matasovic reference does not disclose or suggest all of the recited features of amended claim 1.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over Matasovic. Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1. Claims 2 and 4 are patentable by virtue of their own recited subject matter, as well as by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

### **Claims 9, 11, and 15**

Claims 9, 11, and 15 are patentable because the Matasovic reference does not disclose or suggest all of the recited features of the claims. One of the recited features of amended independent claim 9 that is not disclosed or suggested by Matasovic is “a first receiving portion operable to capture a multi-faceted member of a welding cable with the welding cable oriented in a first direction relative to the handle.” As discussed above, Matasovic discloses a hollow cylinder base member 28 that is secured to the handle tube 47 by clamping means 14. However, the hollow cylinder base member 28 is not multi-faceted. Therefore, the Matasovic reference does not disclose or suggest “a first receiving portion operable to capture the multi-faceted member in a first direction relative to the handle,” as recited in claim 1. In addition, Matasovic does not disclose or suggest “a second receiving portion operable to capture the multi-faceted member of the welding cable with the welding cable oriented in a second direction relative to the handle,” also recited in claim 9. Therefore, the Matasovic reference does not disclose or suggest all of the recited features of amended claim 9.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 9 is patentable over Matasovic. Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1. Claims 2 and 4 are patentable by virtue of their own recited subject matter, as well as by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

**Claims 30 and 31**

Claims 30 and 31 are patentable because the cited reference does not disclose or suggest all of the recited features of the claims. To establish a *prima facie* case, the Examiner must not only show that the combination includes *all* of the claimed elements, but also a convincing line of reason as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972 (B.P.A.I. 1985).

One of the recited features of independent claim 30 that is not disclosed by the Matasovic reference is “a trigger securable to the handle, wherein the handle is adapted to enable the trigger to be positioned in each of four quadrants of the handle relative to the neck.” Matasovic discloses a trigger housing 15 that is securable to the handle tube 47 by a clamp 48. *See* Matasovic, col. 4, lines 45-51. However, Matasovic does not disclose removing and reversing the handle tube 47 to position the trigger housing 15 in any quadrant, as asserted by the Examiner.

Furthermore, the Examiner is engaging in impermissible hindsight reconstruction. There is no suggestion in Matasovic for removing and rotating the handle tube 47. Clamp 48 serves two purposes, clamping the handle tube 47 to the base member 28 and securing the trigger housing 15 to the handle tube 47. *See* Matasovic, col. 4, lines 45-50. One of these purposes would be defeated if the handle tube 47 were removed and reversed because the clamp 48 cannot not secure the handle tube 47 to the base member 28 at the front of the tube 47 if the clamp 48 is used to secure the trigger housing 15 to the handle tube 47 at the rear of the handle tube 47. Furthermore, the portions of Matasovic cited by the Examiner do not support the Examiner’s assertion regarding the

obviousness of removing and reversing the handle tube 47. The cited portion only discloses *rotating* the handle tube to make angular adjustments of the head portion 12 relative to the handle portion 13 to facilitate use of the welding gun 10 in different postures while enabling the operator to maintain normal contact with the handle portion. There is no suggestion from the cited portion for removing and *reversing* the handle tube 47 to reposition the trigger. The Examiner is engaging in impermissible hindsight reconstruction.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 30 is patentable over Matasovic. Claim 31 depends from claim 30 and is patentable by virtue of its own recited subject matter, as well as by virtue of its dependence from claim 30.

**Claim 34 and 35**

Claims 34 and 35 are patentable because Matasovic does not disclose all of the recited features of the claims. One of the recited features of amended independent claim 34 that is not disclosed by the Matasovic reference is “a handle that increases in cross-sectional area between a first cross-section and a second cross-section of the handle.” Similarly, amended independent claim 35 discloses “a handle portion...having a varying cross-sectional area adapted to enable a user grip the handle portion at a plurality of cross-sectional areas.” Matasovic discloses a cylindrical handle tube 47 that does not vary in cross-sectional area. Therefore, Matasovic does not disclose all of the recited features of amended independent claims 34 and 35. Accordingly, amended independent claims 34 and 35 are patentable over the Matasovic reference.

For all of these reasons, claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 11, 15, 30, 31, 34 and 35 are patentable over the Matasovic reference. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

**Second Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-11 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colman. Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended by this response. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-11, and 15 are patentable because Colman does not disclose all of the recited features of the claims. Some of the recited features of amended independent claim 1 that are not disclosed or suggested by the Colman reference are “a second recess operable to receive the member therein in a second direction relative to the handle, the second orientation being opposite the first direction, wherein the second recess is adapted to restrict movement of the member relative to the handle.” As discussed above, Colman discloses a male connector member 52 coupled to the supply cable 12. The left housing member 14 and right front housing member 18 are adapted to receive the male connector member 52. However, the left housing member 14 and right rear housing member 16 are not adapted to receive the male connector member 52 or restrict movement of the connector member 52 relative to the handle.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully challenges the Examiner’s assertion that the handle assembly 13 of Colman is capable of receiving the supply cable 12 from both directions. The handle assembly 13 cannot be reversed so that the left housing member 14 and right rear housing member 16 receive the male connector member 52 and gooseneck assembly 62. In addition, the left housing member 14 and right front housing member 18 cannot be be reversed to clamp the supply cable 12. For all of these reasons, the Colman reference does not disclose or suggest “a second recess operable to receive the member therein in a second direction relative to the handle, the second orientation being opposite the first direction, wherein the second recess is adapted to restrict movement of the member relative to the handle,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the Colman reference does not disclose or suggest all of the recited features of amended independent claim 1.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over Colman. Claims 2 and 4 depend from independent claim 1. Claims 2 and 4 are patentable by virtue of their own recited subject matter, as well as by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

Similarly, the Colman reference does not disclose or suggest all of the recited features of amended independent claim 9. One of the recited features of amended independent claim 9 that is not disclosed or suggested by Colman is “a first receiving portion operable to capture a multi-faceted member of a welding cable with the welding cable oriented in a first direction relative to the handle.” As discussed above, the Colman reference discloses a male connector member 52 disposed within the left housing member 14 and right front housing member 18. However, Colman does not disclose that the connector member 52, or any other member, is multi-faceted. Furthermore, the left housing member 14 and right front housing member 18 does not capture the connector member 52. Therefore, Colman does not disclose or suggest “a first receiving portion operable to capture a multi-faceted member of a welding cable with the welding cable oriented in a first direction relative to the handle,” as recited in amended independent claim 9. In addition, Colman does not disclose or suggest “a second receiving portion operable to capture the multi-faceted member of the welding cable with the welding cable oriented in a second direction relative to the handle,” also recited in claim 9. As discussed above, the handle assembly 13 cannot be reversed so that the left housing member 14 and right rear housing member 16 receive the male connector member 52, much less capture the male connector member 52. Therefore, the Colman reference does not disclose or suggest all of the recited features of amended claim 9.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 9 is patentable over Colman. Claims 10, 11, and 15 depend from independent claim 9. Claims 10, 11, and 15 are patentable by virtue of their own recited subject matter, as well as by virtue of their dependence from claim 9.

For all of these reasons, claims 1, 2, 4, 9-11, and 15 are patentable over the Colman reference. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

**Third Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 9, and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dimock. Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended by this response. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1, 9, and 13-15 are patentable because Dimock does not disclose all of the recited features of the claims. One of the recited features of amended independent claim 1 that is not disclosed or suggested by the Dimock reference is “a first recess operable to receive the member therein in a first direction relative to the handle.” The Dimock reference does not disclose a member secured to the cable, or that the handle 16 has a recess operable to receive the member. In addition, Dimock does not disclose or suggest “a second recess operable to receive the member in a second direction relative to the handle, the second direction being opposite the first direction,” which is recited in claim 1 also.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully challenges the assertion made by the Examiner in the Office Action that the handle portion of Dimock would readily be reversed in end-to-end orientation. Dimock discloses a handle 16 having a first end 76 and a second end 78. *See Dimock, col. 3, lines 53-54.* The first end 76 of the handle 16 mates with a handle connector 42 of the torch head 14. *See Dimock, col. 5, lines 2-4.* The second end 78 has a lip 86 adjacent to a groove 88 that are designed to receive a cable cover fastener 90. *See Dimock, col. 5, lines 58-60.* The cable cover fastener 90 is used to secure a cable cover 20 over the cable set 18. *See Dimock, col. 5, lines 60-64.* The first end 76 does not have the lip 86 and groove 88 to enable the first end 76 to secure the cable cover fastener 90. Thus, the first end 76 of the handle cannot be reversed

to serve as the second end 78. Furthermore, there is nothing in Dimock to suggest that the second end 78 can mate with the handle connector 42 of the torch head 14. Thus, the handle 16 of Dimock would not be readily reversed in end-to-end orientation.

For all of these reasons, the Dimock reference does not disclose or suggest all of the recited features of amended claim 1. Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over Dimock.

Similarly, the Dimock reference does not disclose or suggest all of the recited features of amended independent claim 9. One of the recited features of amended independent claim 9 that is not disclosed or suggested by Dimock is “a first receiving portion operable to capture a multi-faceted member of a welding cable with the welding cable oriented in a first direction relative to the handle.” Dimock discloses a cable set 18 having a water cable 22, a gas cable 24, and a power cable 26. *See Dimock, col. 3, lines 1-5.* The cables of the cable set have multi-faceted connectors (not referenced) for connection to a power supply, water coolant circulator, and gas supply. *See Dimock, Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 1-5.* However, the handle 16 does not capture the connectors. Therefore, the Dimock reference does not disclose or suggest “a first receiving portion operable to capture a multi-faceted member of a welding cable with the welding cable oriented in a first direction relative to the handle,” as recited in amended independent claim 9. In addition, Dimock does not disclose or suggest “a second receiving portion operable to capture the multi-faceted member of the welding cable with the welding cable oriented in a second direction relative to the handle,” also recited in claim 9. Therefore, Dimock does not disclose or suggest all of the recited features of amended claim 9.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 9 is patentable over Dimock. Claims 13-15 depend from independent claim 9. Claims 13 and 15 are patentable by virtue of their own recited subject matter, as well as by virtue of their dependence from claim 9.

For all of these reasons, claims 1, 9, and 13-15 are patentable over the Dimock reference. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

**Fourth Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 27-29, 32, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erickson. Independent claim 27 has been amended by this response. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 27-29, 32, and 33 are patentable because Erickson does not disclose all of the recited features of the claims. Some of the recited features of amended independent claim 27 that are not disclosed or suggested by the Erickson reference are “disposing the operating switch in one of a first handle piece and a second handle piece adapted to capture a welding cable member at each of the first and second ends of the configurable welding handle.” As discussed above, the welding gun 10 of Erickson is not adapted to capture the cable clamp 30 at one, and only one end. The end of the handle 24 opposite the cable clamp 30 is not adapted to capture the cable clamp 30. Therefore, the welding gun 10 of Erickson does not have “a first handle piece and a second handle piece adapted to capture a welding cable member at each of the first and second ends, as recited in claim 27. Therefore, Erickson does not disclose or suggest all of the recited features of amended independent claim 27.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 27 is patentable over Erickson. Claims 28 and 29 depend from independent claim 27. Claims 28 and 29 are patentable by virtue of their own recited subject matter, as well as by virtue of their dependence from claim 27.

Some of the recited features of independent claim 30 that are not disclosed by Erickson are: “the first and second handle pieces being positionable relative to the neck to

enable the position of the trigger on the welding handle to be varied from a first position to a second position, the second position being directly opposite the first position" and "wherein the first and second handle pieces are adapted to be gripped by a hand oriented in a constant orientation relative to the neck with the trigger in both the first and second positions." For the reasons provided above, the ends of the handle 24 of Erickson cannot be reversed. Furthermore, the handle 24 is curved so that if the handle is rotated to orient the trigger 12 in a second position directly opposite a first position, a person gripping the handle 24 could not orient their hand in the same orientation relative to the neck in the second position. Therefore, Erickson does not disclose all of the recited features of independent claim 32.

Accordingly, amended independent claim 32 is patentable over Erickson. Claim 33 depends from independent claim 32 and is patentable by virtue of its own recited subject matter, as well as by virtue of its dependence from claim 32.

For all of these reasons, claims 27-29, 32, and 33 are patentable over the Erickson reference. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

**Fifth Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Matasovic, Colman, or Dimock, in view of Stuart. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 3 depends from amended independent claim 1 and claim 12 depends from amended independent claim 9. For the reasons provided above, independent claims 1 and 9 are patentable over the cited references. Claims 3 and 12 are patentable by virtue of their dependence from claims 1 and 9, respectively, as well as by virtue of their own recited subject matter. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.



Serial no. 10/041,009  
Response to Office Action mailed on March 27, 2003  
Page 27

RECEIVED  
JUL 07 2003  
GROUP 1700

### Sixth Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7 and 19-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuart, in view of either Matasovic, Colman, or Dimock. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 7 depends from amended independent claim 1 and claims 19-23 depend from amended independent claim 16. For the reasons provided above, independent claims 1 and 16 are patentable over the cited references. Claims 7 and 19-23 are patentable by virtue of their dependence from claims 1 and 16, respectively, as well as by virtue of their own recited subject matter. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Ralph A. Graham  
Reg. No. 47,607  
FLETCHER YODER  
P.O. Box 692289  
Houston, TX 77269-2289  
(281) 970-4545

Date: June 27, 2003